

# COMPARATIVE STUDY OF READING ACHIEVEMENT THROUGH USING INFORMATION CATEGORIZING AND FACT-OPINION CATEGORIZING IN SMAN 15 BANDAR LAMPUNG

Irene Brainnita Oktarin, Muhammad Sukirlan, Rosita Simbolon

Email: [irenebrainnita@yahoo.com](mailto:irenebrainnita@yahoo.com)

Mobile Phone: +628996488008

Institution: Lampung University

**Abstract:** The objectives of this research are to investigate which of the two sub-skills in reading is more effective for comprehending the text, and to find out whether there is any significant difference of students' reading comprehension achievement between those who are using information categorizing and those of using fact-opinion categorizing. This is a quantitative study which had intact group pre-test post-test design.

The result shows that there is a significant difference of students' reading comprehension achievement between those who were taught using information categorizing and those taught using fact-opinion categorizing. The significant increase of students' achievement in the experimental class I (information categorizing) is ( $p < 0.05$ ,  $p = 0.00$ ) with the increase of mean in pre-test and post-test is 19.34 points. Meanwhile, in experimental class II (fact-opinion categorizing) the significant increase of pre-test and post-test is also ( $p < 0.05$ ,  $p = 0.00$ ), but the increase of mean is only 12.37. It indicates that the information categorizing is more effective sub-skill than fact-opinion categorizing in increasing the students' reading comprehension achievement.

**Keywords:** Comparative Study, fact-opinion categorizing, information categorizing, reading achievement.

**PENELITIAN PERBANDINGAN PRESTASI MEMBACA MELALUI  
PENGELOMPOKAN INFORMASI DAN PENGELOMPOKAN  
FAKTA-OPINI DI SMAN 15 BANDAR LAMPUNG**

Irene Brainnita Oktarin, Muhammad Sukirlan, Rosita Simbolon

Email: [irenebrainnita@yahoo.com](mailto:irenebrainnita@yahoo.com)

Nomor telepon: +628996488008

Universitas: Universitas Lampung

**Abstrak:** Tujuan dari penelitian ini adalah untuk mencari salah satu dari dua sub-skill dalam membaca yang lebih efektif untuk memahami teks, dan untuk mengetahui apakah ada perbedaan yang signifikan dari pemahaman siswa terhadap bacaan antara murid yang menggunakan skill mengkategorikan informasi dan yang menggunakan skill mengkategorikan fakta-pendapat.. Ini adalah penelitian kuantitatif yang menggunakan pre-test post test desain.

Hasil penelitian menunjukkan bahwa terdapat perbedaan yang signifikan dalam pemahaman membaca siswa antara mereka yang diajarkan menggunakan skill mengkategorikan informasi dan yang diajarkan menggunakan skill mengkategorikan fakta-pendapat. Peningkatan yang signifikan dari pencapaian siswa di kelas eksperimen I (mengkategorikan informasi) adalah ( $p < 0,05$ ,  $p = 0,00$ ) dengan peningkatan 19,34 poin dalam pre-test dan post-test. Sementara itu, di kelas eksperimen II (mengkategorikan fakta-pendapat) juga terdapat peningkatan signifikan dari pre-test dan post-test ( $p < 0,05$ ,  $p = 0,00$ ), tetapi peningkatan nilai rata-rata hanya 12,37. Hal ini menunjukkan bahwa skill mengkategorikan informasi adalah sub-skill yang lebih efektif daripada skill mengkategorikan fakta-pendapat dalam meningkatkan prestasi pemahaman membaca siswa.

**Kata Kunci:** Mengkategorikan informasi, mengkategorikan fakta-pendapat, penelitian perbandingan, prestasi membaca.

## **INTRODUCTION**

Reading is a process of extracting meaning from a written or printed text. The principal goal of reading is comprehension. Without comprehension, reading would be empty. Comprehension is the power of fully understanding, not only intended to know what the letters stand for but also to understand the meanings communicated by texts. Nuttal (1985:5-6) says that the difficulties to comprehend the texts because of some problem such as unfamiliar code, the amount of previous knowledge that reader brings to the text, the complexity of the concept expressed, and vocabulary knowledge. ( See e.g. Clark and Silberstein, 1987; Joyce, 2006; Harmer, 2001; etc)

In high school the students get difficulty in understanding meaning of the some words because they have only little knowledge of vocabulary. The students do not understand the content of the text so that they become lazy to read an English text. The researcher's pre-observation in SMA Negeri 15 Bandar Lampung also indicated that there were several reading problems, the students have trouble of sounding out words and recognizing words in the text, the students have inability to connect ideas in a passage, the students have difficulty to distinguish significant information, the students have difficulty to connect what had been read to prior knowledge, and the students have trouble remembering or summarizing what was read.

To comprehend the text, the students have to know the purpose of reading, to be aware of the type of materials that they read, and to know the reading strategies. There are some factors that cause the students difficulties in comprehending the text: (1) interpreting the new vocabulary, (2) using uninteresting material (text), (3) ignoring use of schemata/background knowledge, (4) ignoring strategies and skills in reading.

To solve the problems of reading is beyond the scope of this research, therefore the researcher focuses on the strategies and skills in reading that are used by the students in the class. It is better for the teacher to consider which sub-skills in reading is the most effective so that it can enable the students to comprehend reading materials. According to Suparman (2012) there are many sub-skills of reading that students should have, i.e. identifying main idea, story plot, topic sentence, sequencing, categorizing, interpreting, etc. However in this research the writer chooses one of sub-skills in reading that is categorizing. The researcher has selected information categorizing and fact-opinion categorizing because they are suitable for students in the first year of senior high school.

Information categorizing is classifying the knowledge, news or data that exists in the text. There are important information and unimportant information. Important information usually is the main idea of the text, meanwhile unimportant information is the supporting idea. For example in report text, its social purpose is presenting information about something. Report text generally describe an entire class of things, whether natural or made: mammals, the planets, rocks, plants,

countries of region, culture, transportation, and etc. Information categorizing is important because the purpose of reading is to find out something or knowledge from the text.

Fact-Opinion categorizing on the other hand is classifying fact (something known to have happened/ reality) and classifying opinion (an appraisal formed in the mind about a particular matter). Fact is something that is undoubtedly true, conditions that actually exist or occur. The fact is completed by evidence that supports the truth. While opinion is something that the truth is still to be tested, estimates, thoughts, or assumptions about something in different. Opinion is usually completed by the reasons for the truth. Fact-Opinion categorizing is important because it is one of comprehension skills critically assess category in reading.

However, as far as the researchs concern, until recently there is no studies comparing the two reading sub-skills toward students' reading comprehension. The writer would like to compare between the two sub-skills in reading, information categorizing and fact-opinion categorizing. These two skills are applicable in Senior High School, especially for the first year.

The researcher intended to find out what sub-skills in reading is more effective between using information categorizing and fact-opinion categorizing in comprehending text and to find out whether there is any significant difference of students' reading comprehension achievement between those who are using information categorizing and those who are using fact-opinion categorizing. The

participants of this research are the first year of SMAN 15 Bandar Lampung. These students because they are assumed to have enough high performance in language components. The materials that will be used are short text and long text with interesting topics. And type of text that will be used is report and descriptive text.

## **METHOD**

In this research, quantitative research with Intact Group Pre-test Post-test Design was conducted to gain the objective of this research. The researcher compared the student's reading achievement between those taught using information categorizing and taught using fact-opinion categorizing. There were two classes; experimental class I and experimental class II. In this case, the experimental class I was students who were using information categorizing and the experimental II was the students who were using fact-opinion categorizing.

The design of the research was presented as follow:

**G1 = T1 X1 T2**

**G2 = T1 X2 T2**

Notes:

G1 : The experimental class I

G2 : The experimental class II

X1 : Treatment I (using information categorizing)

X2 : Treatment II (using fact-opinion categorizing)

T1 : Pre-test

T2 : Post-test

(Setiyadi, 2006, 134-135)

In collecting the data, the researcher used reading test as the instrument. The reading test consisted of pre-test and post-test in multiple-choice form. Pre-test was conducted in each group. The first meeting was pre-test. And the treatment was conducted for three times in each group; the second, third, and fourth meetings. And after the treatment in fifth meeting post-test was conducted in each group.

## **RESULT AND DISCUSSION**

### **Result of Pre-Test**

In the experimental class I, the mean score of the pre-test is 47.10, the highest score is 65 and the lowest score is 15. The median is 50 and the mode is 45 since only 6 students are in this score interval. Meanwhile in the experimental class II, the mean score is 45.13, the highest score is 65 and the lowest is 25. The median is 45 and the mode score is 35 in which there are 8 students. Here we could see that the difference of average score in both experimental classes is not too far. It means that both classes approximately have the same level in term of reading comprehension achievement.

The are on score interval 47-57 (31.6%). There are 30 students (78.9%) score less than 65 and only eight student (21.0%) scores more than 65. In experimenal class II, the students score 38-48 (34.2%). And it also shows that 33 students (86.8%) score less than 65 and only 5 students (13.1%) scores more than 65. It can be concluded that there are only few students who have adequate achievement in reading comprehension. In general, the result of the pre-test of both classes are not

satisfactory since most of the students score below 65, and there are only few students who get the score above 65.

### **Result of Post-Test**

The post-test was administered in order to know whether there is significant increase of the students' achievement in reading after being given treatment. There were 20 items of post-test conducted in 45 minutes.

In experimental class I, the mean score is 66.44; the highest score is 80 and the lowest score is 45; the mode score is 70 in which there are only 6 students. The students are on the interval 64-74 (34.2%). It also shows that 25 students (65.8%) score more than 65 and 13 students (34.2%) score less than 65. It can be inferred that there is an increase of students' achievement in reading comprehension in experimental class I.

In experimental class II, the students are in score interval of 54-64 (52.6%). And only nine students (23.7%) score more than 65 and 29 students (76.3%) score less than 65. We can see that there is improvement of the students' achievement in the experimental class II.

And if the two classes are compared, it can be said that the improvement in experimental class I is higher than in the experimental class II. It can be concluded that the teaching learning process in the experimental class I had better result than in the experimental class II since the number of students in experimental class I



who are able to achieve the mastery learning standard (65.8%) is bigger than the number of students in the experimental class II who are able to achieve the mastery learning standard (23.7%).

Table 9. Analysis of the Hypothesis Test

Group Statistics										
Group		N	Mean	Std. Deviation		Std. Error Mean				
Posttest	1.00	38	66.4474	10.06116		1.63214				
	2.00	38	57.5000	8.28137		1.34342				

  

Independent Samples Test										
		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
Posttest	Equal variances assumed	2.281	.135	4.233	74	.000	8.94737	2.11391	4.73530	13.15943
	Equal variances not assumed			4.233	71.362	.000	8.94737	2.11391	4.73272	13.16202

Table 9 shows that Sig. (2-tailed) is .000. It means that the Sig.  $< \alpha$  ( $p < 0.05$ ,  $p = 0.000$ ). It can be concluded that  $H_1$  is accepted, that there is significant difference between students taught using information categorizing and taught using fact-opinion categorizing.

The increase indicates that information categorizing is more effective than fact-opinion categorizing to increase students' reading comprehension achievement. The information categorizing has made the students aware of what they are reading and what they want to know from the text. It is in line with Brown's (2001:306) statement that efficient reading consists of clearly identifying the purpose in reading something. By doing so, the students know what they are looking for and can weed out the potential distracting information. This make the students become self directed in reading text.

Furthermore, the process of information categorizing help the students to find information from the text. And according to Heilman, Blair and Rupley (1981:4) reading comprehension is categorized into three levels; literal comprehension, interpretative comprehension, and critical comprehension. Information categorizing includes in literal comprehension that is the process of understanding the ideas and information explicitly states in the passage. This activity made them had a control over their learning since there was a guidance that helped the students to find and select the important information and unimportant information existed in the text. It is in line with Grellet's (1981) opinion that reading is the process of understanding a written text, means extracting the required information from it as efficiently as possible. In other word, information categorizing makes the students easy to understand the content of the text.

Meanwhile, in experimental class II the increase of students' reading comprehension achievement is still low. The weakness in fact-opinion categorizing is that students have difficulty to distinguish where the fact is and where the opinion is. They are still confused of the difference between fact and opinion. As Nuttal (1985: 5-6) states one may have difficulty to comprehend a passage because of some problems like unfamiliar code in which the text is expressed, the amount of previous knowledge that the reader brings to the text, the complexity of the concepts expressed, and vocabulary knowledge. Here the complexity of the concepts of fact and opinion present stumbling block to the students.

In addition Heilman, Blair and Rupley (1981:4) have categorized reading comprehension into three levels; literal comprehension, interpretative comprehension, and critical comprehension. Fact-opinion categorizing must use two comprehensions that is interpretative comprehension and critical comprehension. That two comprehensions is used to categorize opinion. Interpretative comprehension here is understanding the ideas and information that is not explicitly states in the passage, for instance to understand the author's tone. And critical comprehension here is analyzing, evaluating and personally reacting to the information presented in a passage. Fact is easy to found in the text, about data, such as date, location, time of occurrence. But opinion is difficult to found, because opinion is not complete and less can be verified. Beside that opinion sometimes is not explicitly stated in the text. So, it is difficult for the students to differentiate between fact and opinion, also they have difficulty to find the opinion. Therefore the researcher as the teacher has to give much expansion and lead the students to classify where the fact is and where the opinion is.

## **CONCLUSIONS AND SUGGESTIONS**

Based on the data analyzed, and the discussion of finding, the researcher has concluded as follow:

1. Information categorizing skill is more effective than fact-opinion categorizing skill in teaching reading comprehension. It can be seen by comparing the total number of students who can achieve the mastery learning between the students taught using information categoizing and taught using fact-opinion categorizing. In experimental class I 25 students (65.8%) score more than 65

and 13 students (34.2%) score less than 65. While in experimental class II only nine students (23.7%) score more than 65 and 29 students (76.3%) score less than 65. In which the number of students who achieve the mastery learning are higher in information categorizing class than in fact/opinion categorizing class. The number of students in experimental class I who are able to achieve the mastery learning standard (65.8%) is bigger than the number of students in the experimental class II who are able to achieve the mastery learning standard (23.7%).

2. There is a significant difference of students' reading achievement between students taught using information categorizing and taught using fact-opinion categorizing. It can be seen by comparing the increase of students' reading comprehension score within both groups. The students' score within the experimental class I has increased significantly from 47.10 to 66.44 point with the increase of 19.34. While in the experimental II it is only from 45.13 to 57.50 points with the increase of mean is about 12.37. Also can be seen from the result of the hypothesis testing which shows that the Sig. <  $\alpha$  ( $p < 0.05$ ,  $p = 0.000$ ).

Considering the result of the research, the writer would like to give some suggestions as follows:

1. Since information categorizing skill can give better result than fact-opinion categorizing skill, it is suggested that English teacher apply this sub-skill as one of the way in teaching reading, besides developing other sub-skills like analyzing, inferring, identifying, etc.

2. The teacher should control and consider the time spent during the teaching learning process through information categorizing and fact/opinion categorizing because it may affect the efficacy of the skill itself.

## REFERENCES

- Brown, H. 2001. *Teaching by Principles and Interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy*. New York: Longman.
- Clark, M.A. and S.S. 1987. *Toward a Realization of Psycholinguistic Principles in ESL Reading Classroom*. New York: New Bury House Publisher.
- Grellet, F. 1981. *Developing Reading Skills: A Practical Guide to Reading Comprehension Exercises*. London: Cambridge University Press.
- Harmer, J. 2001. *The Practice of English Language Teaching*. New York: Longman.
- Joycey, Ed. 2006. *Reading Comprehension: An Interactive Process*. 9<sup>th</sup> February, 2008.
- Lougheed, Lin. 1992. *Regents/ Prentice Hall TOEFL Prep Book : 2<sup>nd</sup> edition*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Lyman, B H. 1971. *Test Scores and What They Mean*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Mc Whrother, K.T. 1989. *College Reading and Study Skills*. London: Scott, Foresman and Company.
- Milan, D K. 1988. *Improving Reading Skills*. New York: Random House.
- Nuttal, C. 1985. *Teaching Reading Skills in Foreign Language*. London: Heinemann Education Book.
- Setiyadi, Ag.B. 2006. *Teaching English as A Foreign Language*. Yogyakarta: Graha Ilmu.
- Shohamy, E. 1985. *A Pratical Handbook in Language Testing for Second Language Teacher*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.
- Simanjuntak, Editha G. 1988. *Developing Reading Skills in A Foreign Language (EFL) Students*. Jakarta: P2LPTK.

Smith, F. 1982. *Understanding Reading*. New York: Holt Rinehart and Winston.

Suparman, U. 2005. *Understanding and Developing Reading Comprehension*.  
Bandar Lampung: University of Lampung.